

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460





JUL 25 1989

OFFICE OF .
SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Ceiling Increase Request for the Shaffer Equipment Site, Minden, WV

-- TRAMSMITTAL MEMORANDUM

FROM: Timothy Fields, Jr., Director

Emergency Response Division

TO: Jonathan Z. Cannon

Acting Assistant Administrator

THRU: Henry L. Longest II, Director

Office of Emergency and Remedial

Attached is a request dated June 21, 1989, from the Region III Regional Administrator for a \$544,180 ceiling increase to the Shaffer Equipment site. If approved, the total project ceiling will be raised from \$3,701,100 to \$4,245,280.

On May 10, 1989, ERD gave Region III a verbal ceiling increase for emergency response activities. These response activities abated a fire/explosion and human direct contact threat posed by twenty-one deteriorating and unsecured drums found on the site. The drums have been stabilized and staged and are now awaiting disposal along with some soil and debris. This work is within the original scope of action of a 1985 removal waiver. The total project cost is estimated to be \$95,675 and the funds are available in the Region's fourth quarter removal allowance.

An additional \$448,900 in ceiling is needed to cover indirect costs that accrued to this removal. When this action was started in 1985, the indirect cost formula, for more accurately estimating removal project ceilings, had not been developed. When the formula was applied during an attempt at cost recovery, these extra costs were attributed to the response action. Consequently, this part of the ceiling increase is an administrative adjustment that requires no new funding.

I recommend that you approve this increase of \$544,180 in the total project ceiling for removal response actions at the Shaffer Equipment site. You may indicate your decision on the attached Regional action memorandum.

Attachment

JUN 2 1 1989

DATE:

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION III

841 Chestnut Building Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Request for Removal Action and

Exemption from the \$2 Million

Limit at the Shaffer Site Minden,

Fayette County, West Virginia

Stephen R. Wassersug, Director/F (

Hazardous Waste Management Division (3HW00)

TO:

SUBJECT:

FROM:

Edwin B. Erickson

Regional Administrator (3RAØØ)

ISSUE

The attached CERCLA funding request pertains to the Shaffer Equipment Site, Minden, Fayette County, West Virginia.

Removal actions performed under the On-Scene Coordinator's Authority Delegation (14-1-A, 9/13/87) were initiated in accordance with the National Contingency Plan due to the direct contact threats to humans present at the site. Additional funds are necessary to complete the removal and thus mitigate the threat posed by the deteriorating and leaking drums onsite.

The continued removal actions meet the criteria of the National Contingency Plan, 40 C.F.R. Section 300.65 and Section 104 (c)(1) of CERCLA. I recommend that you approve this request for the additional funds in the amount of \$544,180, bringing the total project to \$4,245,280.

DATE: JUN 2 1 1989

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION III

841 Chestnut Building Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Request for Removal Action and

Exemption from the \$2 Million Limit

SUBJECT: at the Shaffer Equipment Site, Minden,

Fayette County, West Virginia

FROM: Edwin B. Erickson

Regional Administrator (3RAØØ)

TO:

Jonathon Z. Cannon, Acting Assistant Administrator

Solid Waste Emergency Response (OS-100)

THRU: Henry L. Longest II, Director

Emergency Response Division (OS-200)

ATTN: Timothy Fields Jr., Director

Emergency Response Division (OS-210)

I. ISSUE

The purpose of this memorandum is to request a ceiling increase for the Shaffer Equipment site. A removal action has been initiated under the On-Scene Coordinator's OSC's Emergency \$50,000.00 (Authority Delegation 14-1-A, 9/13/87) to mitigate direct contact threats to humans present onsite. A ceiling increase in the amount of \$544,180 is being requested to complete the removal action. The increase will raise the total project ceiling to \$4,245,280.

These funds are available in the Region's FY 89 removal allocation.

II. BACKGROUND

An EPA removal action occurred at Shaffer equipment between 1984 and 1987. At this time contaminated soil and debris were excavated and disposed of offsite. Additionally at the same time, Mrs. Shaffer (PRP) was given notice about the deteriorating and leaking drums onsite. Mrs. Shaffer was given a list of cleanup firms which she could use for disposing of these remaining drums.

A more detailed background of the Shaffer site may be found in the attached exemption request dated 8/29/85 which was approved under CERCLA Section 104(c) criteria for continuing emergency activities at this site.

III. PRESENT SITUATION

Hazardous Substances Present: Twenty-one drums of potentially toxic hazardous substances are staged at the site. Based on previous site history, it is believed that the drums contain paint wastes and/or waste solvents of unknown origin. Many of the drums were badly deteriorated and were leaking into a diked containment area.

Drum leakage has resulted in contamination of approximately 3,300 gallons of standing water and an estimated 20 cubic yards of soil.

The present status of the removal action is as follows:
Twenty-one drums containing waste unknowns, thought to be paint
wastes and waste solvents, are staged in overpacks awaiting
disposal analysis and final disposal arrangements; one tanker
containing 3,300 gallons of potentially contaminated water, and
one rolloff box of potentially contaminated soil await waste
characterization and final disposal arrangements. All wastes are
stabilized, but are staged in an area of limited access that is
fraught with vandalism.

On April 24-25 1989, EPA revisited the site at the request of the "Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County" group. Senator Jay Rockefeller was in attendance, to answer queries regarding the previous PCB removal operation. The 19 drums for which Anna Shaffer had agreed to assume responsibility (August 1987) were still onsite and in a continuing state of deterioration. EPA OSC again contacted Anna Shaffer and gave her the option of disposing of the drums or having EPA utilize CERCLA funds to mitigate the threat. Mrs. Shaffer indicated that she did not have the resources to remove the drums. In addition, Mrs. Shaffer directed the OSC to two additional drums located near the Shaffer building. The threat posed to the residents of Minden, along with the local health study concerns, reportedly brought on by the previous widespread PCB contamination, prompted the OSC to initiate emergency stabilization measures pursuant to the Delegation of Authority 14-1-A.

EPA, TAT and ERCS mobilized to the site to begin stabilization activities. Initial inspection by the OSC and TAT revealed 19 deteriorated, leaking drums staged in a containment pond with approximately 3,300 gallons of standing water. Extensive soil contamination was apparent given the condition of the drums. Two drums located adjacent to the Shaffer building appeared to contain waste oils which may be toxic and/or flammable.

These materials will be addressed only if analytical results indicate that they contain hazardous substances that pose a threat of human direct contact.

Initial stabilization actions commenced with the removal of the drums from the containment pond, sampling for disposal analysis, and overpacking. A tanker was mobilized for storage of the water and the cleanup contractor also used a trackhoe for overpacking and soil excavation.

It became readily apparent that additional funds would be required for completion of the project, thus mitigating the human direct contact threat posed by the contaminated drums. Additional funds are necessary for completion of disposal analysis of 21 drum samples, one soil sample, and one water sample. Target compound analysis of nine soil samples is necessary to determine the effectiveness of the cleanup. Subsequently, the wastes must await final disposal arrangements and undergo transportation to a certified disposal facility.

NPL Status: The Shaffer Equipment Site is not currently ranked on the NPL. However, EPA is planning an investigation to be conducted within 4 miles of the Shaffer site to determine if the area warrants National Priority List (NPL) status. The future timetable of the investigation is currently being resolved.

Scope of Work: This response is within the original scope of work approved by Jack McGraw, Acting AA/OSWER on 8/29/85. The 104(c) Emergency Exemption criteria continue to be met. The remaining site work to be performed consists of ultimate offsite disposal of the drums, the tanker of contaminated waste water, and one rolloff box of contaminated soil.

IV. ENFORCEMENT STATUS

See confidential Enforcement Status (attached).

V. PROPOSED ACTIONS AND COSTS

The proposed actions and costs are based upon offsite disposal of 21 drums containing waste unknowns, one tanker containing approximately 3,300 gallons of contaminated waste water, and one rolloff box containing contaminated soil.

The continuing removal efforts will include the following:

- complete disposal analysis of 21 drum samples.
- complete disposal analysis of one representative soil sample and one water sample.
- target compound analysis of nine soil samples to determine effectiveness of cleanup.
- staging onsite of 21 overpacked drums, one tanker and one rolloff box pending receipt of analytical data and final disposal arrangements.
- remobilization to the site for transportation and disposal of the waste streams to a certified disposal facility.

The actions taken to date, and the continuing actions outlined above, address near-term threats that may require attention prior to the start of potential remedial action in the vicinity of Minden, WV. Should Minden be placed on the NPL, remedial work would be probable. Hence, as this is the final task of the original response, the mitigation of near-term threats in the area, including the transportation and disposal of the three waste streams, provides a suitable foundation, as well as contributing to the efficient performance, of any future remedial action.

COST SUMMARY:

\$87,175

COSTS FOR PROPOSED ACTIONS:

TOTAL EXTRAMURAL COSTS

EXTRAMURAL COSTS

Cleanup Contractor	\$30,000
Waste Transportation and Disposal	30,000
Cleanup Contractor Subtotal	60,000
15% Contingency	14,250
Cleanup Contractor Total	74,25Ø
TAT Costs	5,000
EXTRAMURAL SUBTOTAL	79,250
10% Contingency	7,925
•	•

INTRAMURAL COSTS

Direct Costs	\$3,000
Indirect Costs	5,500
Other	448,505

ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT \$544,180 CURRENT TOTAL PROJECT CEILING \$3,701,100 PROJECTED TOTAL PROJECT CEILING \$4,245,280

This ceiling increase is for \$544,180. An estimated \$95,675 is the amount anticipated to complete the removal action. The additional \$448,505 is attributed primarily to the change in accounting (cost tracking) system during on-going site operations. In an effort to maintain consistency, the OSC tracked site operational expenses throughout the project by the previous accounting methods. However, the new "Financial Mangement System" (FMS) came into effect prior to completion of the project and therefore costs were unknowingly exceeded. In addition, lengthy and involved cost recovery efforts have also contributed to the project over-run.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Because the conditions at the Shaffer Equipment Site meet the criteria for a removal action under Section 300.65 of the NCP and CERCLA Section 104(c) Criteria, I recommend your approval of this \$544,180 ceiling increase to continue removal actions at this site. Your approval will increase the total project ceiling from \$3,701,100 to \$4,245,280. You may indicate your approval or disapproval by signing below.

Approved / fee	1/ lugues Date \$ 5/7/89.
Acting	Asst Shrifteton
Digapproved	
Disapproved	Date

ENFORCEMENT CONFIDENTIAL STATUS

THE SHAFFER EQUIPMENT SITE MINDEN, WEST VIRGINIA

The Shaffer Equipment Site is a former emergency removal site (1985) at which were left a number of drums that were to be removed and disposed of by a responsible party. Although there was no formal agreement for the PRP work, the verbal agreement has been documented in POLREPs.

THE CERCLA Removal Enforcement Section (CRES) has not completed a potentially responsible party (PRP) search for this action. Mrs. Shaffer, the only identified PRP is not financially viable and can not conduct the required response actions. CRES does not recommend issuance of a unilateral order to Mrs. Shaffer because she will not be able to accomplish the removal.

CRES recommends the Request for Removal Action be approved.

Prepared by:

Karen M. Wolper, Chief June 13, 1989